

REMARKS

The Official Action of February 24, 2006, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application remain claims 16-17 and 29-41, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy provided during the March 31, 2006, telephone interview with the undersigned.

In the interview, Applicant suggested an alternative amendment as shown in amended claim 29 to that suggested by the Examiner during a prior telephone interview on March 17, 2006. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment now before the Examiner more definitely defines over GB 2287882 than that suggested by the Examiner. This is supported by the fact that Applicant believes that GB 2287882 electrodes are integrally constructed on the electrode support, but not -wholly- constructed on the electrode support as now claimed. Further, the GB 2287882 electrodes are not arranged in the same manner as the claimed electrodes.

Appln. No. 10/069,361
Amdt. dated April 3, 2006
Reply to Office Action of February 24, 2006

Applicant understands from the March 31 telephone interview that the Examiner is in agreement with Applicant's proposed amendments, and if so, that the application is now in condition for allowance, which Applicant now requests.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 

Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\C\cohn\Alroy2\PTO\Amd AF 03Apr06.doc